

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/156,952

Applicant(s)

OSTGAARD ET AL.

Examiner

P. Kathryn Bex

Art Unit

1743

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) P. Kathryn Bex (Examiner).

(3) Jill Warden (SPE).

(2) Brian Gaff (agent).

(4) Christopher Stamos (agent)

Date of Interview: 24 July 2002.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: La Blanca et al (USP 4733773)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Kathryn Bex
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner recommends the addition of language which disclose the bottom most edge of the legs being closer to the open end of the container than the closed end. Such language in claim 1 would overcome both the 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph + the 35 USC 102(b) anticipated by La Bianca et al.